

June 29, 2005





INTEGRATED MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM  
REVIEW OF NEVADA AGREEMENT STATE PROGRAM

March 15 - 18, 2005

**FINAL REPORT**

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the review of the Nevada Agreement State program. The

---

answer questions or clarify issues. The team evaluated the information that it gathered against the IMPEP performance criteria for each common and applicable non-common performance indicator and made a preliminary assessment of the Nevada Agreement State program's performance.

---





Due to budget limitations in FY 2004, training for Section staff virtually halted at the beginning of the review period. The limited amount of the training budget, along with out-of-State travel

---



Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommended, and the MRB

---



---



#### 4.0 NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

IMPEP identifies four non-common performance indicators to be used in evaluating Agreement State programs: (1) Legislation and Program Elements Required for Compatibility; (2) Sealed

---

---

---





---

---

Division assumed all oversight responsibilities and became the custodian of the site. The site has continuous security.

It is noted that this LLRW site predates the waste site standards adopted in 10 CFR 61. The State has the funding and plans to continue surveillance and necessary repair through

---

---

---

and cracks in the cap and to take radiation surveys. Two State engineers also accompanied the inspectors to examine the condition of the rip-rap and the trench cap. During the accompaniments, each of the inspectors demonstrated appropriate inspection techniques and knowledge of the regulations and the license. The inspectors were well-prepared and thorough in their review of the site. The inspection was adequate to assess radiological health and safety and the condition of the site.

#### 4.3.4 Technical Quality of Licensing Actions

Pursuant to NAC 459.822, the license was transferred to the Nevada State Health Division on December 30, 1997. The current license expires in December 2007. No licensing actions were completed during the review period.

The team found through observation and interviews with the Las Vegas staff that applicable NRC guidance documents that support 10 CFR 61 activities, are available and used as needed.

#### 4.3.5 Response to Incidents and Allegations

There were no incidents or allegations pertaining to the LLRW program during the review period.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommended, and the MRB concurred that Nevada's performance with respect to the indicator, Low-Level Radioactive







APPENDIX B

NEVADA ORGANIZATION CHARTS

ML050810515 and ML050810582









## APPENDIX C

### INSPECTION CASEWORK REVIEWS

NOTE: CASEWORK LISTED WITHOUT COMMENT IS INCLUDED FOR COMPLETENESS ONLY.

File No.: 1

Licensee: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Technology

Inspection Type: Routine

Inspection Date: 4/13/04





## APPENDIX D

### LICENSE CASEWORK REVIEWS

NOTE: CASEWORK LISTED WITHOUT COMMENT IS INCLUDED FOR COMPLETENESS ONLY.

File No.: 1  
Licensee: Insight Mountain Diagnostics  
Type of Action: Amendment  
Date Issued: 11/23/04

File No.: 2  
Licensee: Desert Heart Specialist  
Type of Action: Amendment  
Date Issued: 7/1/04

File3No.: 2

Nevada Final Report  
Licensing Casework Reviews

File No.: 8  
Licensee: Angle Engineering

Nevada Final Report  
Licensing Casework Reviews

Page D.3

File No.: 16  
Licensee: Barton Memorial Hospital  
Type of Action: Amendment  
Date Issued: 12/24/03

License No.: 04-12-0440-01  
Amendment No.: 04  
License Reviewer: LB



APPENDIX E  
INCIDENT CASEWORK REVIEWS

Note: Casework Listed Without Comment Is Included for Completeness Only.





